REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 8, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-8, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as non-statutory subject matter; rejected claims 1, 4-9, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,738,001 to Aditham et al. (Aditham); and rejected claims 1, 4-9, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0103824 to Koppolu et al. (Koppolu).

By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 5 in response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 to recite the phrase "A computer-implemented software application framework embodied on a computer," as suggested by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 should be withdrawn. Applicant also adds new claims 15 and 16 to claim subject matter to which the Applicant is entitled.

Claims 1, 4-9, and 12-16 are currently pending.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Aditham

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-9, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as unpatentable over Aditham. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a combination of features including, among other things, "a virtual object space providing access to a plurality of objects, each object having a set of functionality and being identifiable by a unique identifier provided by the virtual object space, and providing generic object functionality for the plurality of objects including an associations and transactions functionality for relating the plurality of objects and interaction between the plurality of objects, a distribution functionality for locking,

flushing, and copying of the virtual object space, and a persistency functionality for maintaining persistency of the plurality of objects."

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's allegation on page 9 of the Office Action that Aditham discloses the "a virtual object space," as recited in claim 1. In particular, the Examiner alleges that Aditham at col. 7, lines 43-53 discloses the following feature of the claim 1 virtual object space: "a distribution functionality for locking, flushing, and copying of the virtual object space." A careful scrutiny of Aditham at col. 7, lines 43-53 (and FIG. 7) reveals that the passage relied upon by the Examiner merely reveals a "class definition diagram," not the above-noted feature. For at least this reason, Aditham fails to disclose "a virtual object space ... providing generic object functionality for the plurality of objects including an associations and transactions functionality for relating the plurality of objects and interaction between the plurality of objects, a distribution functionality for locking, flushing, and copying of the virtual object space, and a persistency functionality for maintaining persistency of the plurality of objects," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Aditham, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claim 1 and claims 4 and 13, at least by reason of their dependency from independent claim 1, should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 9, although of different scope, include features similar to those noted above with respect to claim 1. Claims 6-8 depend from claim 5. Claims 12 and 14 depend from claim 9. For at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, claims 5-9 and 12-14 are not anticipated by Aditham, and the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 13, the Examiner alleges that Aditham at FIG. 3, col. 5, lines 15-35, and col. 6, lines 47-65 discloses a portlet. However, the noted portions of Aditham

relied upon by the Examiner merely refers to a window, and a window does not constitute a portlet, much less "providing a portlet to access the generic object functionality to visualize the structure of the plurality of objects," as recited in claim 13. For this additional reason, claim 13 is not anticipated by Aditham, and the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Koppolu

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-9, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as unpatentable over Koppolu. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's allegation on page 9 of the Office Action that Koppolu discloses the "a virtual object space," as recited in claim 1, and, in particular, that Koppolu at paragraph 0458 and 0404 discloses the following feature of the claim 1 virtual object space: "a distribution functionality for locking, flushing, and copying of the virtual object space." A careful scrutiny of Koppolu at paragraph 0458 reveals that Koppolu's document can use a hyperlink object to save, load, drag, drop, cut, and paste, but there is nothing in paragraph 0458 that relates to "a distribution functionality for locking, flushing, and copying of the virtual object space." With respect to paragraph 0404, instead of disclosing aspects of "a distribution functionality for locking, flushing, and copying of the virtual object space," Koppolu merely describes that downloading may be "block[ed]" or "not blocked" in the context of storage binding ("BindToStorage function"). For at least these reasons, Koppolu fails to disclose "a virtual object space ... providing generic object functionality for the plurality of objects including an associations and transactions functionality for relating the plurality of objects and interaction between the plurality of objects, a distribution functionality for locking, flushing, and copying of the virtual object space, and a persistency functionality

for maintaining persistency of the plurality of objects," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Koppolu, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claim 1 and claims 4 and 13, at least by reason of their dependency from independent claim 1, should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 9, although of different scope, include features similar to those noted above with respect to claim 1. Claims 6-8 depend from claim 5. Claims 12 and 14 depend from claim 9. For at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, claims 5-9, 12 and 14 are not anticipated by Koppolu, and the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 13, the Examiner alleges that Koppolu at paragraph 0012, FIGS. 5-7, and paragraphs 0191 and 0539 discloses a portlet. However, the noted portions of Koppolu relied upon by the Examiner appear to at best describe browsers and windows, which do not constitute a portlet, much less "providing a portlet to access the generic object functionality to visualize the structure of the plurality of objects," as recited in claim 13. For this additional reason, claim 13 is not anticipated by Koppolu, and the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Regarding new claims 15 and 16, Applicant submits that these new claims are not anticipated by the cited references at least by reason of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 9, respectively.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner. Applicant submits that the proposed amendments do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner. Finally, Applicant submits that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner continue to dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. No fee is believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-162-UTL/2003P00269US.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8 May 2007

Pedro F. Suarez
Reg. No. 45,895

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
9255 Towne Centre Drive, Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92121
Customer No. 64280
Tel.: 858/320-3040
Fax: 858/320-3001